

Date: Thu, 3 Nov 94 04:30:18 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: List
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #517
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 3 Nov 94 Volume 94 : Issue 517

Today's Topics:

 I PASSED MY TECH TODAY!!!
 Is this a Part 97 violation?
 May I transmit or not?
 NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins (3 msgs)
 Open Letter to Jeff Herman was Re: Deleting Richard Cris
 TPK-182
 Type Acceptance - What is the logic behind it? (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 30 Oct 1994 22:38:53 GMT
From: daniel.meredith@aznetig.stat.com (Daniel Meredith)
Subject: I PASSED MY TECH TODAY!!!

-> Path: stat!news.primenet.com!news.asu.edu!asuvax!cs.utexas.edu!howlan
-> From: tomsunman@aol.com (TOM SUNMAN)
-> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
-> Subject: I PASSED MY TECH TODAY!!!
-> Date: 30 Oct 1994 13:09:03 -0500
-> Organization: America Online, Inc. (1-800-827-6364)
-> Lines: 11
-> Sender: news@newsbf01.news.aol.com
-> Message-ID: <390nfv\$c78@newsbf01.news.aol.com>
-> NNTP-Posting-Host: newsbf01.news.aol.com
->
-> I Passed my Technician exams today!!! I can hardly contain mys

-> Thanks to all who answered my questions about HT's, I went with the
-> HTX-202. Nice Rig.
-> Now comes the hard part.....waiting for the license!!! What a
-> thrill, I can hardly wait!
->
-> 73's to all
->
-> Tom Randall
-> (waiting for his callsign!)
->

Congratulations and welcome to the ever growing Ham Community!

Dan

----- \-----/ -----
Arizona Network Intertie Group
"Serving Az's Digital Needs Since 1993"

Daniel J. Meredith - N7MRP	Voice: +1-602-809-7384
P.O. Box 44563	Fax : +1-602-956-2566
Phoenix, Arizona	BBS : +1-602-912-0225
85064-4563	

List Owner: F6fbb-List@Stat.Com
Arizona Amateur Radio Packet Coordinator

Date: 1 Nov 1994 23:55:06 -0500
From: gregspiv@aol.com (Gregspiv)
Subject: Is this a Part 97 violation?

In article <36i3sa\$gdg@scratchy.reed.edu>, jfilner@reed.edu (jfilner)
writes:

I would think that using the autopatch as a preplanned way to respond to your employers emergency would at the least be a very grey area that should be avoided if at all possible. I work in commercial radio and there are many alternatives to using Ham radio for communications, all of which your employer should provide you. After all what if, for example, all volunteer firemen used digital beepers and called in on the Ham autopatches for there calls. All are emergencies and would probabaly qualify for loss of life or property, but they have a suitable home on other freq. If you get paged once a month and have to call in for a

emergency then you are probably entering the very grey area. Hams must not profit in any way from ham radio is the way I see it. Just be ready if it is ever questioned, but don't worry the FCC is very understanding after all they were trained by the same people at the IRS....Hmmmmmm.....

Date: 2 Nov 1994 15:20:45 GMT
From: alata@ganges.ece.utexas.edu (Dr. Arata)
Subject: May I transmit or not?

Hi this is Arata W5/7K3RFF(till I will receive US license).

Thank you everyone replying my message.

You all are correct.

I sent e-mail to KJ4KB who is a Regulatory Information Specialist in ARRL HQ. Within 30 minutes, he reply me and he said "You can be still on the air (great!) till you will receive US license." As you know, the reason someone said "wait" is my BAD english. He might not understand my situation.

I am now W5/7K3RFF.
Thank you again and see you on the air.

73 de Arata Miyauchi W5/7K3RFF
alata@ganges.ece.utexas.edu

Date: Sun, 30 Oct 1994 22:21:48 GMT
From: wa2ise@netcom.com (Robert Casey)
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins

In article <1994Oct29.000208.29686@news.csuohio.edu> sww@csuohio.edu (Steve Wolf) writes:

>What's to understand? It seems like people keep trying to assign intent
>to the receiving station ... but intent for what? Why take a bulletin that
>walks like a _bulletin_ and talks like a _bulletin_ and call it a "message"?
>

>All bulletins are broadcasting. They are sent in many directions. When being
>forwarded, the receiving station did not ask for them. The sending station
>has no expectation that the receiving BBS will read or reply to them.
>

When I post something (be it a mod file, or an image file, or short program, or recipe, etc) to @WW or @USA or whatever, I anticipate that someone out there would be interested in reading it. I do get replies

thanking me for image files (a teacher in France told me he's going to use the "comet hitting Jupiter" images I posted in his class, which might get some of his kids interested in ham radio maybe, another set of replies when I posted an image of myself, all positive, no flames).

As Gary K_____ (sorry, forgot your call) (the guy at a destructive test lab) pointed out, the FCC considers all the packet posts as 3rd party traffic. As long as you don't do something of "percunary(sp) interest" or use dirty words, it's okay. Somewhat similar to hams on HF or 2meters talking about the weather or health problems, in that the content is not directly related to radios.

Date: Sun, 30 Oct 1994 23:04:09 GMT
From: sww@csuohio.edu (Steve Wolf)
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

Robert Casey (wa2ise@netcom.com) wrote:

:
: As Gary K_____ (sorry, forgot your call) (the guy at a destructive test lab)
: pointed out, the FCC considers all the packet posts as 3rd party traffic.

Please do advise when and where the FCC made such a determination. Please post the text!

73,
Steve

Internet : no8m@hamnet.wariat.org
Amateur Radio : no8m@no8m.#neoh.oh.usa.na

Date: Wed, 2 Nov 94 10:32:38 -0500
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

Steve Wolf <sww@csuohio.edu> writes:

>Clearly, a BBS phone port with a anonymous check-in allows the public access
>to relayed transmissions. There are LOTS of phone ports that allow
>anonymous check-ins.

>

>So, originators of bulletins which are sent by any means to a BBS that has
>a public phone port that are not about amateur radio would fall under
>broadcasting.

No, because the members of the public are not receiving the bulletins *via

Hello All,
The LONG Awaited release of TPK-182 has occured...It was released
this October and is Now Available...

TPK-182.ZIP Is Available from the F6FBB-SUPPORT BBS in The United States
at:

+1-602-912-0225 300-28.8KB V.34 Protocol All Common Protocols....

TPK-182 is Also Available from The Internet By UUEncoded E-Mail Request:

Send E-MAIL To:

TPK@AZNETIG.STAT.COM

No Subject or Message Necessaary, You will automatically receive an
E-Mail that contains TPK-182.ZIP UUEncoded

PLEASE NOTE: The File Is NOT Split, So Be Certain Your Mail Server Can
Handle LARGE Pieces of Mail.

TPK-182 Is Also Availabe by SASE Disk Mailer, Enclose (1) One 1.2 or
1.44 Formatted Floppy Disk and a Postage Paid Return Envelope and
Send To:

Daniel J. Meredith N7MRP
P.O. Box 44563
Phoenix, Az 85064-4563

Enjoy TPK-182!!!

73 de Dan N7MRP@N7MRP.AZ.USA.NA
White Page-World Server Station...

/EX

----- \-----/ -----
Arizona Network Intertie Group
"Serving Az's Digital Needs Since 1993"

Daniel J. Meredith - N7MRP
P.O. Box 44563
Phoenix, Arizona
85064-4563

Voice: +1-602-809-7384
Fax : +1-602-956-2566
BBS : +1-602-912-0225

List Owner: F6fbb-List@Stat.Com
Arizona Amateur Radio Packet Coordinator

Date: Wed, 2 Nov 94 10:36:21 -0500
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>
Subject: Type Acceptance - What is the logic behind it?

Ken A. Nishimura <kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU> writes:

>No. Nothing says that you can't operate a fire dept. radio in the ham
>bands. If you can get the radio tech at the FD to reprogram your FD
>radio to operate on the ARES rept frequency, you're all set. It IS
>ILLEGAL to use your 2m HT on FD frequencies for the reasons above.

That can't be emphasized too strongly -- the programming must be done by
someone with a commercial ticket, or else the radio can no longer be used in
the public safety services (or anywhere else but the amateur bands) until it
has been checked out by a licensed technician to ensure compliance.

Date: 2 Nov 1994 00:57:07 GMT
From: kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU (Ken A. Nishimura)
Subject: Type Acceptance - What is the logic behind it?

In article <CyLzxK.E10@news.cv.nrao.edu>,
JOE BRANDT <jbrandt@sadira.gb.nrao.edu> wrote:
>

>I have heard of something called type acceptance. In my case I am a member
>of a small volunteer fire & rescue squad and also a ham. I have authorization
>to use the radio frequencies dedicated to this service, when conducting
>rescue operations.

Type acceptance means that the FCC has examined a sample of the product
and found that it meets all technical requirements for that service.

As long as the manufacturer makes each unit "identically" to the sample, each unit doesn't have to be approved by the FCC -- hence the type of radio is approved. Incumbent in type acceptance for radios in Part 90 and I believe Part 80 is that the user not be able to select the frequency of operation other than through a predetermined channel.

This is why you need specialized software and hardware to program Motorola radios. You cannot have direct entry of frequency, either by keypad or dial knob in a type accepted radio.

>Can I modify my 2-meter HT for use in the Fire-Dept band? Why not?

No. Your 2-meter HT has the ability for the user to determine frequency of operation. Thus, it is ineligible for Part 90 type approval. Technically, I am confident that any modern 2-meter radio passes the technical requirements for Part 90, but the FCC doesn't want users to pick frequencies at random.

>Do I really have to carry two radios to coordinate efforts between
>ARES & the local Fire Dept?

No. Nothing says that you can't operate a fire dept. radio in the ham bands. If you can get the radio tech at the FD to reprogram your FD radio to operate on the ARES rept frequency, you're all set. It IS ILLEGAL to use your 2m HT on FD frequencies for the reasons above.

=ken

Date: Wed, 2 Nov 1994 02:26:04 GMT
From: dmunroe@vcd.hp.com (Mr. Black)

References<3938vv\$2fg@gerald.cc.utexas.edu> <393eec\$c8s@news.iastate.edu>,
<3964l1\$esd@ixnews1.ix.netcom.com>
Subject: Re: CW exemption for Old Fellows?

michael silva <mjsilva@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>The guy who submitted the petition is a 67 year-old Tech, and he claims that
>old age results in diminished faculties and that people 65 and older were
>severely disabled in terms of passing a code exam...

Hmmm, perhaps the FCC was a bit too hasty in denying the waiver... I'd say we make a fair trade: since his faculties are diminished we give him the waiver but take away his driver's license.

-Dave

```
-----v-----
| Dave Munroe          | xx7xxx   Tech+HF, just another QRP DX addict |
| dmunroe@vcd.hp.com   |          |
|                      | (awaiting license) |
|-----|
| You know you've been studying code too long when you automatically try to |
| decode random clicks and rattles inside your house, car, or office.      |
|-----|
```

Date: Wed, 2 Nov 1994 00:16:12 GMT
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

References<1994Oct31.190339.15079@arrl.org>
<1994Oct31.221121.768@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <1994Nov1.165835.10035@arrl.org>
Reply-To: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject: Re: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah

In article <1994Nov1.165835.10035@arrl.org> ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare (KA1CV))
writes:

>
>Actually, I think it is the slowness that I like, although at 40 wpm, using
>normal CW abbreviations that bring the effective rate up to about double
>that, I really can't call it slow. What I like about CW is that I have
>plenty of time to think about what I am doing, and what I want to say. When
>I get in front of a microphone I find myself at a loss for words (believe it
>or not!) and really don't have a good time at it.

Ah well, I've never had *that* problem. :-)

But I understand what you're saying. Having time to think and review
is even more true in the digital modes due to the usually non-realtime
nature of the messages.

Gary

```
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV          | You make it,      | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it.     | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way           | Guaranteed!      | gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244   |                  |
```

Date: Wed, 2 Nov 1994 02:27:32 GMT

From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

References<19940ct24.140426.901@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> <102794072745Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <38rm5k\$3hb@crcnis1.unl.edu>

Reply-To: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

Subject: Re: Kindness and ham radio

In article <38rm5k\$3hb@crcnis1.unl.edu> gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown) writes:

>

>Sure enough. And while this thread is getting very far from ham
>radio, it actually does shed some light on relevant discussions,
>believe it or not.

>

>The libertarian would say that since the _difference_ in speed kills,
>not the speed itself, they conclude that, since so many people break
>the law by speeding, we should raise the speed limit so those slow
>law-abiding folk don't cause accidents. Is that logical, or what?

>

>This is the same sort of logic these people apply to amateur radio.
>In their own (strangely) logical minds, it makes perfect sense.

>

>How bout if everyone just obeyed the speed limit? Wow, what a
>concept, huh? I'm sure your time isn't _that_ valuable.

Ah, but that's where you move off into fantasyland. Since most people *don't* obey the arbitrarily low speed limits, how do you propose to make them change? They've voted with their right feet to obey the *natural* speed limit of the road rather than the arbitrarily imposed one, even in the face of speed traps and fines. One could attempt to impose more and more fascist and draconian enforcement and fines, but that only leads to resentment of authorities, and disrespect for laws seen as being contrary to physics.

It would be like declaring that the value of pi was 3.0 by legal fiat. People would soon realize when the circle didn't close that the law's an ass, and that the Emperor is wearing no clothes. The same holds here. The interstates were designed for a 70 MPH speed with 1950s vehicles and suspensions. That's reflected in the 1000 foot minimum radius for turns, the 3% maximum grades, the angle of bank in turns, and a host of other design factors. With modern vehicles and suspensions, the natural limit is even higher.

Cover the speedometer, and people will drive at the natural speed of the road. Uncover it and require them to maintain a speed below that natural speed, and they'll constantly be having to slow down as they notice they're going over the limit. Since that's unnatural,

they'll soon begin to question whether it's rational. Since it's relative speeds that determine hazard, the arbitrary limits are irrational, so people will tend to disobey the irrational limits.

The law and physical reality have to mesh if laws are to be obeyed consistently. The situation here requires either raising the arbitrary speed limits, or changing road design to lower the natural speed of the roadways. Until one or the other is done, compliance with the law will be poor.

This tells us something very deep if we care to consider it. And it has implications for other intersections of natural and manmade law.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #517
